



The Task Force on Court Facilities
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

North Planning Committees Meeting Report
Wednesday, April 05, 2000 9:00 AM

Superior Court of California, County of Solano
321 Tuolumne Street
Vallejo, CA

ATTENDEES: NORTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS: PRESENT: Sheriff Robert Doyle Justice Kremer Hon. Michael Nail Mr. Anthony Tyrrell ABSENT: Hon. Joan B. Bechtel Mr. Gary Freeman GUESTS Mr. John Simon, Yolo County Public Works	CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE: Ms. Kathleen Halaszynski, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Mr. Ken Jandura, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall - Spillis Candela Mr. Jay Smith, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall TASK FORCE STAFF: Ms. Patricia Bonderud, Facilities Planner, AOC
--	--

I. OPENING REMARKS

Sheriff Doyle welcomed the committee members and opened the meeting shortly after 9:00 am.

II. COUNTY PRESENTATIONS

Ken Jandura and Kathleen Halaszynski presented an overview of the current facilities, comparing the state of existing facilities to future needs for the following counties:

Del Norte County (Presented by Ken Jandura)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- Crescent City County Courthouse (2 courtrooms)
 - Physical rating: 77.4% Adequate
 - Functional rating: 68.75 Marginal
 - Poor ventilation causing private secure side to leave door open for air (inadequate HVAC).

Justice Court (1 courtroom)

- Physical rating: 71.43% Marginal

The key planning issues considered include:

- Geography (moderately sized county with projected growth around Crescent City)
- Available land for new court facility located on adjacent block
- Probation and District Attorney located in existing courthouse

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – Consolidate/Reuse
 - Expand current county courthouse by adding 2 courtrooms and increasing size of court administration by relocating Probation and District Attorney.
- Option #2 – Consolidate/Construct New
 - Construct a new 4-courtroom facility with court administrative space on adjacent site.

Comments:

- Consensus to add to planning options:
 - Option #1 – Abandon Sheriff's Courtroom and add 2 courtrooms
 - Option #3 – Keep Sheriff's Courtroom and add 1 new courtroom
- Justice Kremer—suggest using a minimum addition option. (i.e. continue use of the Sheriffs Courtroom)
- Sheriff Robert Doyle – Size of the county cannot justify tripling the number of square feet.
- Hon. Michael Nail – The real cost would be adding one courtroom over the next 20 years costing approximately \$2.3 million. There needs to be cost estimates by each planning option so that the county administrators can decide which one(s) are viable.
- Sheriff Robert Doyle – What is the impact of the Pelican Bay Prison on the Crescent City County courts? Justice Kremer – and the impact on judgeship growth?

Actions:

- Consultant is to adjust planning costs in Section 2, and include adjusted cost estimates for each planning option.

Trinity County (Presented by Ken Jandura)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- Weaverville (2 courtrooms)
 - Physical rating: 98.04% Adequate (age: 143 years + renovation)
 - Functional rating: 68.75% Marginal
- Hayfork & Trinity Center
 - In use only once a month for small claims (fish & game).
 - Due to minimal and small claims use, building has no security, inadequate courtroom size, no separate circulation, no judge's chamber and no public amenities.

The key planning issues considered include:

- Small growth: FTE's current 2.0, projected 2.3
- Geography: Moderately sized County
- Commitment to Access to Courts
 - Judiciary satisfied with functional and operational issues of courthouse, just concern with security issues.

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – Status Quo
 - Continue to use main court facility in Weaverville with security enhancements

- Option #2 – Construct New Facility
 - Construct new 2 courtroom facility in Weaverville

Comments:

- Hon. Michael Nail – If projected judgeships will be 2, perhaps we should use in the database only the requirement of 2 courtrooms.

Actions:

- Consultant is to adjust planning costs in Section 2, and include adjusted cost estimates for each planning option.

Humboldt County (Presented by Ken Jandura)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- Eureka County Courthouse (7 courtrooms)
 - Physical: 75% Adequate
 - Functional: 50% Deficient
 - Building was not designed for courthouse use (thus, columns located at the center of courtrooms).
 - Minimum private circulation.
- Veteran's Building (3 courtrooms)
 - Physical: 74.1% Adequate
 - Functional: 12.5% Deficient
 - NO private circulation—everyone comes through the front door
- Juvenile Detention (1 courtroom)
 - Functional: 81.25% Adequate
- Garberville (1 courtroom)
 - Physical: 25% Deficient
 - Functional: 42.86% Deficient
 - Used only once or twice a month.
- Hoopa (1 courtroom)
 - Physical: 59.32% Marginal
 - Functional: 81.25% Adequate

The key planning issues considered include:

- Geography: Moderately sized county
- Objective to continue in-custody trials in Eureka
- Planning to conduct jury trials in Garberville
- Commitment to access to courts (exploring mobile courthouse)
- Courts ordered by County to vacate Veterans Building
- Courts planning to vacate Juvenile Detention in near future
- Hoopa facility recently seized by tribe, but returned.
- Expand internally

The consultant team presented the following **planning options for Eureka** to the committee:

- Option #1 – Maximum Reuse
 - Continue to use County Courthouse and Veterans Building. Vacate Juvenile and move courtroom to County Courthouse. Enhance security at County Courthouse.
- Option #2 – Partial Consolidation
 - Continue to use County Courthouse, but expand internally. Vacate Veterans Buildings and Juvenile Facility. Relocate staff and judges to County Courthouse.

- Option #3 – Maximum Consolidation
 - Construct new 10-courtroom facility on East Side of county jail in Eureka. Vacate Veterans Building and Juvenile Facility.

The consultant team presented the following **planning options for Garberville and Hoopa** to the committee:

- Option #1 – Maximum consolidation
Construct new 1 courtroom facility with court support space.

Actions:

- Consultant is to adjust planning costs in Section 2, and include adjusted cost estimates for each planning option.

Napa County (Presented by Kathleen Halaszynski)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- New Trial Court Courthouse (5 courtrooms)
 - Physical: 91% Adequate
 - Functional: 100% Adequate
 - HVAC relies on one package unit—if the system fails, everything in the building goes down. There is NO back-up system.
- Historical Courthouse (4 courtrooms)
 - Physical: 63% Adequate
 - Functional: 69% Marginal
 - No perimeter screening and no separation between public and private circulation.

The key planning issues considered include:

- Geography: Moderate to small sized county (rural/agricultural landscape; mountains, valleys)
- Centralized system in the City of Napa
- Increase Technology (electronic filing)

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – Reuse All Existing; Internal Expansion Historic Courthouse
- Option #2 – Reuse All Existing; Build New Family & Juvenile Court

Comments:

- Hon. Michael Nail – Add charts:
 - cross-referencing 1) jury-capable and 2) in-custody capable
 - (Table 2.15) adjusted shortfall
- Justice Kremer –
 - Napa County, like Humboldt County probably do not need to spend that much money to upgrade its facilities because they seem to be pretty sufficient.
 - The options should be looked at in a progression of a few years. That the estimated costs are the total amounts for a long-term project.
 - Add cost estimates to each planning option.

Actions:

- Consultant is to adjust planning costs in Section 2, and include adjusted cost estimates for each planning option.

Sonoma County (Presented by Kathleen Halaszynski)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- Hall of Justice (16 courtrooms)

- Physical: 62% Adequate
- Functional: 69% Marginal
- SAFETY ISSUE: 2 floor holding cells—dangerous and ineffective
- Coddington Annex (2 courtrooms)
 - Physical: 71% Adequate
 - Functional: 79% Marginal
- Juvenile Delinquency Court (1 courtroom)
 - Physical: 57% Marginal
 - Functional: 69% Marginal

The key planning issues considered include:

- Geography: Moderately sized county
- Centralized system in the City of Santa Rosa
- Maintain a Mixed use facility with the County

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – Reuse all courtrooms as-is. Add five new courtrooms.
 - 1A: Displace Court related & Non-Court related tenants and backfill including Old Jail
 - 1B: Demolish Old Jail and construct addition
 - 1C: Demolish office space & Old Jail and construct addition
- Option #2 – Reuse all courtrooms except Coddington Annex. Add 7 new courtrooms (2 in Hall of Justice + 5 new).

Comments:

- Justice Kremer – We should include a chart with projected courtroom needs (e.g. Sonoma County needs 3 courtrooms in 20 years).

Actions:

- Consultant is to adjust planning costs in Section 2, and include adjusted cost estimates for each planning option.

III. MEETING SCHEDULE

The next committee meeting will occur on May 17th, 2000.

IV. CLOSING REMARKS

Sheriff Doyle called the meeting to a close at approximately 2:10pm.